	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Interview Summary	09/973,261	LUNDQUIST ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Caixia Lu	1713

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) *Caixia Lu*.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(3)*Stephen Johnson*.

(2) *Richard Clikeman*.　　　　　　　　　　(4)_____.

　　Date of Interview: *17 February 2004*.

　　Type:　a)☐　Telephonic　b)☐　Video Conference
　　　　　　c)☒　Personal [copy given to:　1)☐ applicant　　2)☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:　d)☐ Yes　e)☐ No.
　　If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached.　g)☐ was not reached.　h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: *Applicants' representatives agree to limit the matrix material to polymeric, thus, overcome the rejection over Metisons. It is also noted that Baukova's product of zirconocene hydrides and polybutadiene is in gel form, therefore, said product can not be used as catalyst* .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

_____
Examiner's signature, if required